

## H.B. 148 (2007) PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

1. Why should we prefer non-Utah residents moving into the state and into private schools over Utah residents whose children may have attended Utah private schools for years and who have paid Utah taxes? (line 100)
2. The State Board has no authority/resources to "investigate private schools for compliance" (lines 343-344) or look at books, records, student attendance information, bank accounts, etc.
3. The touted Milwaukee program is a city-wide program. It also has more requirements that private schools must meet and caps the number of students who may participate. Springville or Draper or Logan may be interested.
4. What about residential treatment facilities **not** licensed by the state (there are many)—line 189. This discourages licensing.
5. What possible incentive does private school (or parents, in many cases) have to tell State Board about discontinued attendance? (Line 284)
6. NO licensing requirement for teachers (not even alternative licensing). Same language as Carson Smith bill. Though the lack of professional requirements perhaps is justified for severely disabled students, public dollars should support quality instruction. Also, no requirement for teachers/employees to have minimal background check. The standard is even lower than private schools that are accredited.
7. Family relationship requirements (and their verification) are intrusive and may be counterproductive. For instance, "parents" would receive more voucher money by living together than by being married.
8. Lines 83-84: "Tuition" includes textbook fees? State chooses to pay for private school textbooks, shouldn't it do the same for public school students?